



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/824,273

04/14/2004

Aron Hall

030186

6208

26285

7590

06/26/2007

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS LLP
535 SMITHFIELD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/26/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,273

Applicant(s)

HALL, ARON

Examiner

Thanhnga B. Truong

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/14/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU2135

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on April 14, 2004. Claims 1-28 are pending. At this time, claims 1-28 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 10-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

a. Referring to claim 22:

Claim 22 recites "a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium, the program comprising instructions for: quantifying damages avoided by one or more blocked attacks; and calculating security protection consumption during a period of time." The claim is clearly a software program and it is non-statutory as not being tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Furthermore, applicant has pointed out in the specification (paragraph [0012] of page 4) that the computer readable medium may comprise a disk, a device, **and/or a propagated signal**, which clearly including intangible media such as signals, carrier waves, transmissions, optical waves, transmission media or other media incapable of being touched or perceived absent the tangible medium through which they are conveyed. Therefore, claim 22 recites a non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 23-28 are depended on claim 22, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 22 above.

b. Referring to claim 10:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 22, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 22 above.

Claims 11-15 are depended on claim 10, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 10 above.

c. Referring to claim 16:

Art Unit: 2135

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 22, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 22 above.

Claims 17-21 are depended on claim 16, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liang (US 7,062,553 B2).

a. Referring to claim 1:

i. Liang teaches a network security apparatus comprising:

(1) a billing server configured to calculate security protection consumption during a period of time by quantifying damages avoided by one or more blocked attacks (**see abstract; column 2, lines 34-44; column 11, lines 7-20 of Liang**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein calculating security protection consumption further includes determining whether a blocked attack would have exploited a network vulnerability (**column 9, lines 1-11 of Liang**).

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein determination if a blocked attack would have exploited network vulnerability is determined by replaying the attack on the internal network (e.g., LAN) **(column 9, lines 1-11 of Liang)**.

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) further comprising a scanner configured to scan one or more devices for vulnerabilities **(column 10, lines 22-31 and 51-63 of Liang)**.

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein the scanner is configured to quantify the risk of one or more devices **(column 11, lines 7-20 of Liang)**.

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein the scanner is located within a customer network **(column 10, lines 51-63 of Liang)**.

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) further comprising an intrusion suppression module configured to block attacks **(column 2, lines 40-44; column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 2 of Liang)**.

h. Referring to claim 8:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein the intrusion suppression module is configured to maintain a list of attacks sustained and blocked during a period of time **(column 6, lines 56-67; column 2, lines 34-44; column 11, lines 7-20 of Liang)**.

i. Referring to claim 9:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein the intrusion suppression module is located outside (e.g., remote location) a customer network **(column 9, lines 5-7 of Liang)**.

j. Referring to claims 10-15:

i. These claims consist a network security method to implement from the network security apparatus of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-9 above.

k. Referring to claims 16-21:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1-9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-9 above.

l. Referring to claims 22-27:

i. These claims consist a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium to implement by the network security method of claim 10 from the network security apparatus of claim 1, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1-9 above.

m. Referring to claim 28:

i. Liang further teaches:

(1) wherein the computer-readable medium comprises one or more of a memory module, a disk, a device, and a propagated signal (**column 1, line 60; column 2, line 50 of Liang**).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Cohen et al (US 6,952,779 B1) discloses system and method for risk detection and analysis in a computer network (see Title).

b. Shostack et al (US 6,298,445 B1) discloses computer security (see Title).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and

Art Unit: 2135

phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.


AU 2135

TBT

June 20, 2007